

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-13 are pending in the present case. Claim 1 is the only independent claim. The final Office Action makes the following rejections:

(1) Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,211,579 to Blair (hereafter "Blair") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,541,828 to Rozman (hereafter "Rozman") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,933,049 to Melse (hereafter "Melse");

(2) Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blair in view of Rozman and Melse and further in view U.S. Patent No. 4,236,198 to Ohsawa et al. (hereafter "Ohsawa"); and

(3) Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blair in view of Rozman, Melse and further in view U.S. Patent No. 5,450,308 to Tai (hereafter "Tai").

Applicant respectfully traverses each rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicant asserts that the claimed invention is distinguishable from any combination of Blair, Rozman, Melse, Ohsawa, and Tai for at least the following reasons:

Applicant has argued that Blair fails to teach a specified voltage sensor section (32) for detecting an output from a specified one of the secondary circuits, in particular Vout2. In response, the Examiner alleges at page 2 of the final Office Action that,

...Blair teaches a sensing circuit (32) for sensing the "a specified one" (Vout2) of the secondary circuit and notes that although the circuit also senses another voltage, the claims do not limit to just one voltage.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's allegations. For instance, according to Figure 1 of Blair, the sensor circuit (32) detects all of the output voltages (secondary outputs) Vout2 – VoutN, except for the main line Vout1. However, this

MRC/JMA/cm

feature of Blair is quite distinguishable from the present invention, wherein the specified-voltage sensor section (17) detects the output voltage of a specified one of the secondary circuits. Blair fails to choose a specified one of the secondary circuits and then fails to detect the voltage only on that specified circuit. Instead, as noted above, Blair detects multiple secondary circuits. Detecting multiple circuits simultaneously is not the same as detecting a specified one of the circuits. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under §103(a) related to Blair's detecting system, however in order to expedite prosecution, claim 1 is amended to expressly note that "only" one specified circuit is being detected.

Applicant has also argued that Blair fails to teach that the total power sensor section (converter control circuit 12) detects total secondary power that is the sum of power outputs to all the secondary circuits. In response, the Examiner alleges that the claims do not limit the total power sensor to detecting the total secondary power but rather only a "total power sensor section for detecting a value in accordance with a total secondary power which is a sum of power outputs to all the secondary circuits." The Examiner's argument is confusing and unclear.

Total secondary power in Blair is not $V_{out2} - V_{outN}$, as asserted by the Examiner. Instead, total secondary power in Blair is $V_{out1} - V_{outN}$. With that being said, Blair fails to teach *a control circuit or sensor that detects* such a total power. Blair's sensor circuit (32) clearly fails to detect the output from V_{out1} (see Blair, Fig. 1). As such, Blair fails to detect a value representing a total secondary power that is a sum of power outputs to all the secondary circuits.

None of the secondary references cited by the Examiner (Rozman, Melse, Ohsawa, or Tai) cure the deficiencies described above. The Examiner asserts that the on/off switch 10 of Melse described in Col. 5, lines 29-38 correspond to "quasi-shortening". However, since Blair fails to teach or suggest detecting the total secondary power as described above, the feature "controlling turning on/off of the switching device in accordance with a detection result from the total power sensor section" cannot be taught nor made obvious by any combination of Blair, Rozman, Melse, Ohsawa, or Tai.

The secondary references simply fail to make up for the deficiencies found in Blair. As discussed in Applicant's previous remarks, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met, one criteria being that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. In the instant application the Examiner has not met this burden, and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits a notice of allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact James M. Alpert, Reg. No. 59,926 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant


MRC/JMA/cm